

## V. CONCLUSION

After a thorough and comprehensive investigation<sup>643</sup> of Verizon PA's claim that it is now in compliance with the statutory requirements enumerated in section 271(c) of TA-96, based on the record developed in this proceeding, we find that that Verizon PA has demonstrated substantial and sufficient compliance to warrant a favorable 271 recommendation from the PAPUC.

Our findings are the culmination of years of effort by the PAPUC, its staff, Verizon PA, and many interested parties to ensure strict and full compliance with each of the 14-point Checklist items listed in section 271(c). The overall examination was based on the paper filings and testimony, as well as countless hours of informal discussions with Verizon PA, CLECs, and interested governmental agencies to the extent permitted by our *ex parte* rules. Moreover, it has focused on every aspect of Verizon PA's wholesale operations and service to CLECs. It incorporates by reference the comprehensive review of Verizon PA's OSS completed in December 2000 by the third-party evaluator, KPMG Consulting, acting under the direct supervision of the PAPUC.<sup>644</sup> Our findings are also based on our consideration of our recent decisions in a number of other dockets, including our Functional/Structural Separation Order, UNE Pricing Order, and Collocation Order, of which we have taken administrative notice, and Verizon PA's June 7, 2001 unconditional acceptance of the further conditions set forth in our June 6, 2001 Secretarial Letter.

Verizon PA has made substantial progress in developing the tariffs, interconnection agreements, processes and procedures necessary to develop a competitive market in Pennsylvania. On June 6, 2001, by Secretarial Letter, we found specifically

---

<sup>643</sup> We have examined Verizon PA's filing, received comments and responses, held 24 days of technical conferences, received responses to data requests, and held three days of *en banc* hearings.

<sup>644</sup> KPMG Consulting also acted as an advisor to the PAPUC during the commercial operations period.

that Verizon PA complies with the statutory requirements of section 271(c)(1)(A) regarding the presence of facilities-based competitors. In that same Secretarial Letter, we also found that Verizon PA complies with its statutory obligations under section 271(c)(2)(B) for all checklist items except certain PAP and electronic billing concerns relevant to section 271(c)(2)(B)(ii) "Network Elements" and section 271(c)(2)(B)(xiv) "Resale."

Based upon our concerns, we established conditions that Verizon PA had to meet to satisfy our concerns and to achieve full compliance. By its unconditional acceptance by letter dated June 7, 2001, Verizon PA has now satisfied our remaining concerns regarding the adequacy and permanence of the PAP, and the timeliness and accuracy of electronic billing. Therefore, in the PAPUC's judgment, the Pennsylvania local telephone markets are now fully and irreversibly open to competition. The PAPUC further finds that allowing Verizon PA into Pennsylvania's in-region long distance market will provide additional public benefit by giving Pennsylvania customers greater choice in that market as well. With open local markets supported by functional/structural separation of Verizon PA retail and wholesale operations, as well as more long distance choice, the PAPUC concludes that approval of Verizon PA's 271 application would in the public interest. Therefore, we hereby recommend that the FCC approve Verizon PA's section 271 application to offer in-region, long distance telephone service in Pennsylvania.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bohdan R. Pankiw", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Bohdan R. Pankiw  
Chief Counsel

For the Pennsylvania Public  
Utility Commission

Dated: June 25, 2001

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**  
**Harrisburg, PA 17105**

**Consultative Report on Application  
of Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc. for  
FCC Authorization to Provide  
In-Region Inter-LATA Service  
in Pennsylvania**

**Public Meeting – June 6, 2001  
JUN-2001-L-67  
Docket No. M-00001435**

**DISSENTING STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER NORA MEAD BROWNELL**

Today, the Commission is addressing whether Verizon Pennsylvania has satisfied the requirements of Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. This is necessary to determine whether Verizon should be permitted to provide in-region inter-LATA service in Pennsylvania. The central theme of the Section 271 requirements is that we must determine whether Verizon has irretrievably opened its local calling markets to competition.

I have long advocated for competitive markets for both local and long distance communications services. Unfortunately, I cannot join to approve the proposed Secretarial Letter now before us. I cannot, in good conscience affirm that these markets are open as envisioned under the act.

In my judgment, Verizon Pennsylvania must take further action to demonstrate that the local exchange and exchange access markets in Pennsylvania are fully and irreversibly open to competition. Unless Verizon makes the following adjustments, Verizon's Pennsylvania's markets cannot be said to be irreversibly open.

First, regarding electronic billing - Verizon must implement adjustments to its electronic billing systems to insure that CLECs are able to obtain timely and accurate electronic bills. In addition, I believe that the system must successfully complete at least two billing cycles. Without confidence that the billing systems are absolutely able to deliver adequate services and billing support to its customers, I cannot see how the market can work.

Second, carrier-to-carrier data integrity and the change management process is still inadequate. Throughout the 271 process KPMG, our third party consultant, as well as our staff often found inconsistencies in the

carrier-to-carrier data due to differences in their interpretation of the metrics and Verizon's business rules. That KPMG could not certify the accuracy of the data is a matter of great concern. A common understanding is essential to not only securing the integrity of the carrier-to-carrier reports but also to our subsequent analysis of those reports. In addition, and equally important to the success of the process, is the requirement of advance notice of any changes to the calculation or interpretation of metrics. During the 271 process Verizon generally did not provide advance notice to either the Commission or the CLECs of its intention to change its interpretation or calculations of a metric. These processes should be transparent to the Commission and to the CLECs. Changes in a mutually agreed upon protocol cannot be made unilaterally by one party if a system is to work. These issues should be fully addressed and resolved prior to Verizon obtaining Commission approval.

Third, in order to obtain full compliance with Section 271 for local loops, Verizon must complete two tasks. One, Verizon must commit to an implementation schedule for improved access to remote terminal information (as outlined in Verizon's Supplemental Checklist Declaration, Attachment 239). Two, it must satisfactorily explain and, if necessary, correct any apparent failures in commercial performance with respect to its obligation to provide non-discriminatory access to local loops as measured by the appropriate metrics (including but limited to PR-1-01, PR-2-02, PR-4-02, PR-5-01, PR-6-01, PR-8-01, and MR-5-01).

Fourth, in order to obtain full compliance with Section 271 for local transport, Verizon should also satisfactorily explain, and, if necessary, correct apparent poor commercial performance with respect to its obligation to provide non-discriminatory access to local transport by the appropriate metrics (including but not limited to PR-4-01, PR-4-09, PR-8-01, and PR-8-02).

Fifth, compliance by Verizon for the resale of Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) service is required for non-discriminatory access. Currently, Verizon does not appear to comply because Verizon and its data affiliate, Verizon Advanced Data, Inc. (VADI) market and sell a combination of voice and DSL service on the same line to retail customers. However, this package of voice and data service is not available for resale. While each component is available for resale, the voice/data package is not. In order to be compliant, a voice/data package for resale should be made available. Verizon's June 5, 2001, letter may offer to have this package, but the letter does not cogently distinguish between line sharing and resold lines. Thus, Verizon's must give its unequivocal commitment to delivering this product.

Sixth, a permanent Performance Assurance Plan, together with appropriate self-executing remedies, performance standards, and other features is essential for a positive recommendation to the FCC. Everyone must understand the definition and consequences of performance failure. A plan with these features would properly incent Verizon to provide and to continue to provide adequate and non-discriminatory service to CLECs after Section 271 approval is obtained. Since the parties to this proceeding have agreed to adopt the New York metrics, adoption of a remedies plan modeled upon the New York remedies plan is also appropriate, especially regarding the level of remedies exposure. In addition, Verizon must withdraw its pending appeal challenging the Commission's legal authority to impose remedies. Absent such a withdrawal, no PAP can be considered adequate and permanent to prevent backsliding.

It is true that Verizon's efforts to date have yielded some improvement in relevant areas and for that I commend them. However, full compliance in these areas is clearly lacking. I can only speculate whether this process will move forward based on promises by Verizon. But based on Verizon's past performance in following other Commission orders, it is difficult to imagine that such action will accomplish the desired result. Therefore, I cannot support a positive report based on speculation.

My reluctance to cast a vote based on promises of future action is further supported by our experience with the separation of Verizon's advanced data affiliate, VADI. On April 26, 2001 John Cullina, VADI's counsel, testified at the Commission's en banc hearing that no decision had been made about folding VADI back into Verizon as a result of the Ascent decision. (Trans. En Banc Hearing, April 26, 2001, p. 274) However, on that very day Verizon filed a request with the Federal Communications Commission to accelerate Verizon's right to provide advanced services directly without using the separate advanced data affiliate. (Verizon's April 26, 2001 cover letter and filing with the FCC) Consequently, while I would like to believe that Verizon will fulfill all of its promises, given the circumstances I find it difficult to have a confidence in a company which has apparently misled this Commission on the record. This, too, needs clarification.

I believe the Commission must ensure full compliance with resolution of the above matters. By not ensuring absolute compliance we not only jeopardize having a fully and irreversibly open local telephone markets in Pennsylvania for competitive phone companies, but also Pennsylvania consumers who will not have greater choice in telecommunications. There

may be some immediate benefits for consumers, but I believe they will be short term and ephemeral.

For the above reasons, I respectfully dissent from the majority. This market is not sustainable absent a guarantee of full open access, as well as, certainty on rules and accountability.

Please let me express my sincere appreciation to each of the Commission's Section 271 team members for the enormous amount of time, energy and effort you expended regarding the Section 271 process. I applaud your commitment and integrity.

6/6/2001  
Date

Nora Mead Brownell  
Commissioner

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17105**

**CONSULTATIVE REPORT ON  
APPLICATION OF VERIZON  
PENNSYLVANIA, INC. FOR FCC  
AUTHORIZATION TO PROVIDE  
IN-REGION INTER-LATA  
SERVICE IN PENNSYLVANIA**

**PUBLIC MEETING JUNE 6, 2001  
MAR-2001-L-67  
Docket No. M-00001435**

**STATEMENT OF  
COMMISSIONER TERRANCE J. FITZPATRICK  
CONCURRING IN PART, AND DISSENTING IN PART**

The majority concludes that Verizon will have satisfied, upon acceptance of certain conditions, every item on the fourteen-point checklist for determining whether its local market is open to competition, and that we should recommend that the Federal Communications Commission allow Verizon to enter the long-distance market in Pennsylvania. I agree that Verizon has satisfied most of the checklist items; however, as explained below, I do not believe that it has satisfied checklist items 2 (due to a deficient billing system) 4, or 5. Accordingly, I dissent in part.

At the outset, I must say that I wish I could give Verizon an unqualified endorsement. I recognize the benefits of allowing Verizon to provide long-distance service in Pennsylvania. However, the Telecommunications Act plainly requires Verizon to satisfy the fourteen-point checklist before it enters the long-distance market. If my view prevailed, the Commission could establish a process that would allow Verizon to correct the remaining problems and file a Section 271 Application within less than six months. Unfortunately, I must conclude that the majority is overlooking certain problems in reaching a conclusion that Verizon should be allowed into the long-distance market immediately without resolution of the problems.

**CHECKLIST ITEM 2**

Checklist item 2 requires that Verizon provide non-discriminatory access to network elements in accordance with the requirements of Sections 251(c)(3) and 252(d)(1). Because of the lack of timely and accurate electronic bills, I find that Verizon has not met Checklist item no. 2.

The problem here is that, despite its efforts over the past two years, Verizon has yet to provide CLECs with an electronic bill which is sufficiently reliable that Verizon will consider it the official "bill of record." The practical effect of this on CLECs is that every month they are required to sort through and read hundreds of boxes of paper bills in order to check the accuracy of their bills.<sup>1</sup> This is an impossible task for the CLECs, and it is ironic that they are forced to endure such a procedure in this high-tech industry. One CLEC even testified that it estimates what it owes Verizon and pays that amount, and Verizon accepts that payment because it cannot prove otherwise.<sup>2</sup>

Verizon states that CLECs can now receive an electronic bill, and it has recently made an offer to CLECs to allow them to use the electronic bill as the "bill of record." However, Verizon still needs to work through various open issues, complete certain system changes on June 16, 2001, and run it through several billing cycles. (4/25/01, Tr. 102, 146) Thus, the fact remains that the e-billing system is unreliable.<sup>3</sup>

The FCC has granted Section 271 Applications in Massachusetts, New York, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. In all of these states, there was an operational electronic billing system in place.<sup>4</sup> The majority accepts Verizon's promise that it will soon provide the "official bill" in electronic form, and relies on penalties to attempt to ensure compliance. However, the FCC has stated that :

---

<sup>1</sup> MCI testified that it receives "box after box of unauditable paper bills. 150 boxes per month, growing by 30 boxes a month" and it continues "to have errors in crediting. . . [and] problems with the ability to audit the BOS-BDT." (4/25/01 Tr., 97)

<sup>2</sup> John Curry, of Curry Communications, testified that: "As far as what we owe Verizon, it's pretty much a gut feeling, and I think all resellers can attest that we pay them what we believe we owe them, and some day we will all be in disputes because...there is no tracking of credits....We have no idea what [the credits are] for." 4/25/01, Tr. 97-98. Ms. Rubino of Z-tel testified "We estimate what our bills should be, and we pay that amount, and we dispute the rest of it." 3/7/01, Tr. at 137.

<sup>3</sup> During the en banc hearings, when asked when the e-bills will become the official bill of record, Verizon responded: "at such time that Verizon feels that the BOS/BDT has met all of the issues that were identified by the CLEC community and we [Verizon] have had an opportunity to work through several billing cycles. Verizon would be, at that point in time, in the position to attest that the BOS/BDT, if elected by a CLEC, would become their official bill of record." (4/25/01 Tr., 102) CLECs claim to have identified at least 10 billing problems that CLECs have brought up over the past 10 months, "most" of which Verizon claims to have resolved. (4/25/01 Tr., 102) Later, Verizon refers to 66 billing issues mutually identified by Verizon and the CLECs as being open in October 2000, 41 of which were resolved prior to April 21. Ten were to have been fixed on April 21 (with BOS/BDT Version 35), 7 were to have been fixed on May 19, and the remainder on June 16. The April 21 fixes did not happen as planned, and the change notice to the CLECs of the delay in implementing Version 35 was late. (4/25/01 Tr., 103-107) Other failed fixes are detailed in the transcript.

<sup>4</sup> The FCC's prior Section 271 Orders do not address any issues with respect to lack of electronic billing. After conversations with the FCC, it is staff's understanding that BA NY, SWBT TX, SWBT KS/OK and VZ MA all had properly-functioning electronic billing systems in place at the time of Section 271 approval in their respective states.



"[A] BOCs promises of *future* performance to address particular concerns raised by commenters have no probative value in demonstrating its *present* compliance with the requirements of Section 271. In order to gain in-region, interLATA entry, a BOC must support its application with actual evidence demonstrating its present compliance with the statutory conditions for entry, instead of prospective evidence that is contingent on future behavior. Thus, we must be able to make a determination based on the evidence in the record that a BOC has actually demonstrated compliance with the requirements of Section 271."<sup>5</sup>

Based upon the evidence and the FCC's standard of review, I find that the electronic billing system available to CLECs today is not in compliance. Therefore, I would require, for a finding of full compliance with its obligations under subsections (ii) and (xiv) of Section 271 (c)(2)(B), that Verizon PA must implement the scheduled fixes<sup>6</sup> to its electronic billing system and the billing products must run through two billing cycles successfully.

Another problem with Verizon's billing system is missing billing completion notices (BCNs). BCNs represent the final confirmation for CLECs that an order has been completed by Verizon. Untimely or missing BCNs can result in double billing to customers, and can prevent customers from being able to change products and services. The New York experience of backsliding with missing notifiers puts this Commission on notice that missing notifiers can be so problematic as to actually halt competitive development within a state.<sup>7</sup>

Currently, Pennsylvania does not have a metric to measure missing BCNs; however this is being addressed in a further proceeding stemming from our *Functional/Structural Separations Order* (adopted March 22, 2001, at Docket

---

<sup>5</sup> *In the Matter of Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service in the State of New York*, CC Docket No. 99-295, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 99-404 (rel. December 22, 1999) at ¶ 37; *In the Matter of Application by SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, And Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Texas*, CC Docket No. 00-65, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 00-238 (rel. June 30, 2000) at ¶ 38.

<sup>6</sup> I note that Verizon plans to implement a new billing system called "ExpressTRAK" at some point in the future. Staff has advised that ExpressTRAK is intended to comply with a merger obligation on Verizon to have uniform billing footprint wide. It was believed to be scheduled for introduction in PA for the summer 2000, then later to October 2000. It is yet to be installed.

<sup>7</sup> Missing notifiers became so problematic in New York that Verizon paid over \$13,000,000 in penalties and was forced to install a new system to correct the problem.

No. M-00001353). Verizon admitted that if the NY metric for BCNs were applied to PA data, Verizon would have failed the metric for all three months<sup>8</sup> of commercial operations. (4/4/01, Tr. 47) For this reason also, I find that Verizon's billing system is deficient.

#### **CHECKLIST ITEMS 4 AND 5**

Checklist item 4 requires local loop transmission from the central office to the customers premises, unbundled from local switching or other services. Checklist item 5 requires local transport from the trunk side of a wireline local exchange carrier switch unbundled from switching or other services. With respect to checklist items 4 and 5, discrepancies exist between our staff's findings and KPMG's final report. I am hesitant to summarily dismiss staff's findings, as the majority does.

It appears that KPMG's evaluation of Verizon's marketplace performance during the commercial availability period was limited in scope. KPMG limited the scope of their review to discrepancies between CLECs and Verizon data during the commercial availability period. If Verizon's data indicated that performance was poor, and CLECs did not dispute the data, then KPMG did not consider it.

Staff evaluated Verizon's marketplace performance using Verizon's own data. While CLECs filed comments on the performance data, the CLEC comments did not form the principal basis of staff's analysis because of timing and data integrity issues. Staff analyzed Verizon's data using three tools (all prepared by Verizon): (1) Carrier-to-Carrier reports for January, February and March; (2) C2C Guidelines (dated 2/5/01), which define the performance requirements established by the PUC in the PMO; and (3) Verizon's Measurements Declaration Attachment 403 (dated 4/18/01), which sorts the metrics by checklist item.

Staff identified the instances where Verizon's performance met the standard and the instances where Verizon's performance was sub-standard. In defining sub-standard performance, staff took a conservative approach by defining sub-standard performance more narrowly to allow for checklist compliance where Verizon missed a standard by an inch rather than a mile.

The conclusion reached by staff was that sub-standard performance occurred as to certain metrics applicable to several checklist items. Staff concluded that checklist items 4 and 5 had significant sub-standard performance as to certain metrics, and staff could not find a consistent trend of improvement, including into April. Staff has considered the totality of the commercial operations data on a checklist-by-checklist basis as reported and summarized by

---

<sup>8</sup> This would include all of January, February and March on a prorated basis, and this assumes a 95% performance standard. While I note that January and March are marginal misses, in February, performance dropped to 86.99%. I believe that the February performance is significant enough to warrant implementation of a BCN metric with corresponding remedies.

Verizon in Measurements Declaration Attachment 403 (dated April 18, 2001). Accepting Verizon's C2C reports as accurately reflecting Verizon's performance, staff found that Verizon's own data shows poor performance with respect to loops and transport.

Because of the gravity of staff's findings, I would have preferred to have the parties comment on the analysis done by staff. There would have been time to conduct this review if we had required Verizon to prove that its billing system is working.

### **CONCLUSION**

I emphasize, again, that it is not my desire to unduly delay Verizon's entry into the long-distance business. If my preferred approach were followed, and if Verizon proved that the problems with the electronic billing system were corrected, and if Verizon satisfied the other requirements I have described, I could fully support Verizon's Application. Unfortunately, I cannot conclude that Verizon has satisfied all of the checklist items at this time.

DATE: June 6, 2001

*Terrance J. Fitzpatrick*  
TERRANCE J. FITZPATRICK  
COMMISSIONER

## **Acknowledgements**

The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission would like to recognize the following staff members who participated in this extensive review and analysis of Verizon Pennsylvania's compliance with Section 271 of TA-96.

### **Team Leaders**

Maryanne Martin, Law Bureau, Track A Team Leader (14-point Check List )  
Louise Fink Smith, Law Bureau, Track B Team Leader (OSS/Commercial Operations Data)  
Gary Wagner, FUS, Technical Team Leader

### **Administrative Law Judges**

ALJ Wayne Weismandel, OALJ, Track A Technical Conferences  
ALJ Michael Schnierle, OALJ, Track B Technical Conferences

### **Staff in Alphabetical Order**

Alphonso Arnold, OSA	Yen Nguyen, FUS
William Barrett, FUS	Deanne O'Dell, Law Bureau
Lois Burns, Law Bureau	Cyndi Page, Communications Office
Patricia Krise Burket, Law Bureau	Mohan Samuel, FUS
Rhonda Daviston, Law Bureau	David Screven, Law Bureau
Deirdre R. Farley, FUS	Greg Shawley, CEEP
Jane Foster, FUS	James Strausbaugh, FUS
Carl S. Hisiro, Law Bureau	Mathew Totino, Law Bureau
Shirley Johns, Law Bureau	Louis F. Samsel, FUS
Dale Kirkwood, FUS	Verdina Showell, OSA
Nancy Kling, Law Bureau	Joseph Spandra, FUS
Robert Longwell, Law Bureau	Richard Watson, FUS
Robert Marinko, OSA	

### **PAPUC Commissioners' Telecommunications Assistants**

Ramona Cataldi, Margaret A. Morris, H. Kirk House, Gail Wickwire, Kim Hafner, Joseph Witmer, and Jeanine Schleiden

---

FUS is the PAPUC's Bureau of Fixed Utility Services, Robert Rosenthal , Director  
OSA is the PAPUC's Office of Special Assistants, Cheryl Walker Davis, Director  
OALJ is the PAPUC's Office of Administrative Law Judge, Robert Christianson Chief ALJ  
Law Bureau is the PAPUC's Law Bureau, Bohdan R. Pankiw, Chief Counsel  
CEEP is the PAPUC's Bureau of Conservation, Economics and Energy Planning,  
Z. Ahmed Kaloko, Director

**Appendix A**  
**List of Global Order UNEs**

## **APPENDIX A – A List of Global Order UNEs**

### **Verizon-PA Tariff 216 Rate Elements**

- 1. Local Call Termination**
  - Traffic Delivered at Verizon PA End Office
  - Traffic Delivered at Verizon PA Tandem
- 2. Unbundled Loops (by Density Cell)**
  - POTS (Analog 2-wire)
  - ISDN
  - Customer-Specified Signaling (2-wire)
  - DS-1
  - DS-3
  - ADSL Capable (2-wire)
  - HDSL Capable (2-wire)
  - SDSL Capable (2-wire)
  - IDSL Capable (2-wire)
  - HDSL Capable (4-wire)
- 3. Local Switching Ports**
  - POTS/PBX/Centrex w/ all vertical features
  - POTS/PBX/Centrex w/ all vertical features except;  
3-Way Calling  
Centrex Intercom  
Custom Ringing  
Calling Number Delivery Back
  - ISDN (BRI)
  - ISDN (PRI)
  - Pay Telephone Line
  - DID
  - Switched DS1
  - IDLC Analog
  - Unbundled Public Access Line (UPALP)
  - Unbundled Coin (UCP)
- 4. Ancillary Features for UPALP or UCP**
  - International Direct Dial Blocking (IDDB)
  - Line Side Answer Supervision
  - Call Type Blocking

- Inward Screening
  - Outward Blocking
  - One-way Restriction – Inward Blocking
5. Local Switching
    - Originating
    - Terminating
  6. Trunk Ports
    - End Office (dedicated)
    - Tandem (dedicated)
  7. Tandem Switching, per MOU
  8. Dedicated Transport (per facility & per mile)
    - Voice Grade/DS-0
    - DS-1
    - DS-3
    - DDS
  9. Common Transport
    - Tandem Switching
    - Transport (fixed & per mile)
  10. Entrance Facilities
    - 2-wire Voice Grade Channel Termination
    - 4-wire Voice Grade Channel Termination
    - DS-1 to Voice Grade Multiplexing
    - DS-1 Channel Termination
    - DS-3 to DS-1 Multiplexing
    - DS-3 Channel Termination
  11. Digital Cross-Connect System
    - DS-0 Cross-Connect
    - DS-1 Cross-Connect
  12. Expanded Extended Loop (EEL) Arrangements
    - DS-1/2-w or 4-w Analog, 2-w Digital ISDN
    - DS-1/2-w Analog, 2-w Digital ISDN w/concentration
    - DS-3/DS-1/2-w or 4-w Analog, 2-wire Digital ISDN
    - DS-3/DS-1/2-w Analog, 2-wire Digital ISDN w/ concentration
    - DS-3/DS-1
    - DS-1
    - DS-3

- 2-wire Analog loop w/ EEL Transport
- 4-wire Analog loop w/ EEL Transport
- 2-wire Digital ISDN loop w/ EEL Transport
- 2-wire Analog EEL Transport
- 4-wire Analog EEL Transport
- 2-wire Digital ISDN EEL Transport
- 4-wire Digital DS-0 EEL Transport

**13. Unbundled Network Element Platform (UNE-P)**

- Analog Platform
- ISDN-BRI Platform
- ISDN-PRI Platform
- Analog Centrex Platform
- ISDN-BRI Centrex Platform
- Analog Foreign Exchange Platform
- ISDN-BRI Foreign Exchange Platform
- DS-1 DID/DOD/PBX Platform
- DS-1 DID/DOD/PBX Foreign Exchange Platform
- ISDN-PRI Foreign Exchange Platform
- Coin Platform
- Public Access Line Platform

**14. Unbundled Network Interface Device (NID)**

- 2-wire NID
- 4-wire NID

**15. Time & Materials**

- Service Technician
- Central Office Technician



#### 16. Customized Routing

- To Reseller Platform
- To Verizon PA Platform for Re-Branding

#### 17. Signaling and Databases

- STP Port Termination
- SS7 Link

#### 18. 800/888 Database

- Basic Query
- Vertical Query

#### 19. LIDB Validation

- LIDB Point Codes
- Calling Card Query
- Billed Number Screening Query
- Storage of OTC's Data in LIDB Database

#### 20. AIN Service Creation (ASC) Service

- Developmental Charges
  - Service Establishment
  - Service Creation Access Port
- Service Creation Usage
  - Remote Access
  - On-Premise Access
- Certification and Testing
- Help Desk Support
- Service Subscription Charge
- Database Queries
  - Network Query
  - CLEC Network Query
  - CLEC Switch Query
- Trigger Charges
  - Line Based
  - Office Based
  - Utilization Element
- Service Activation Charges
  - Network Service Activation
  - CLEC Network Service Activation
  - CLEC Switch Service Activation
- Service Modification
  - DTMF Update
  - Switch Based Announcement

**21. Access to Operation Support Systems**

- Pre-Ordering
- Ordering

**22. Maintenance & Repair**

- ECG Access
- EB/OSI Access

**23. Billing**

- CD-ROM

**24. Daily Usage File**

- Existing Message Recording

**25. Delivery of DUF Data Tape**

- per Programming Hour
- per Tape

**26. CMDS**

- per Programming Hours
- per Message

**27. DUF Transport**

- 9.6 Kb Communications Port
- 56 Kb Communications Port
- 256 Kb Communications Port
- T1 Communications Port

**28. Network Control Programming Coding**

- per Programming Hour/per Port

**29. Operator & Directory Assistance Services**

- Direct Access Query
- Direct Access Service Establishment
  - Per Requesting CLEC
  - Per Link/per CLEC
- Directory Assistance per Call
- Directory Transport
  - Tandem Switching
  - Tandem Switched Transport (per call and per mile/per call)
- Operator Services, live
- Operator Services, automated
- Custom Rebranding for DA and/or Oper Svcs

- Carrier-to-carrier LSV/VCI requests

### **30. Physical Collocation Cross-Connect Charges – Voice Grade**

#### **31. Virtual Collocation**

- Cross-Connect Charges
  - Voice Grade
  - DS1 w/ EDSX
  - DS1 w/ CFA

## **Appendix B**

### **List of Further UNEs**

## **APPENDIX B –List of Further UNEs**

### **A. Digital Services**

1. ADSL Capable Loop      Tariff 216, Section 3.C.1.g (Sheet 7A)
  - Manual Pre-Qualification
  - Engineering Query
  - Cooperative Testing – Turn-Up
  - Cooperative Testing – Maintenance
  - Mechanized Pre-Qualification
  
2. HDSL Capable Loop      Tariff 216, Section 3.C.1.h (Sheet 7B)
  - Manual Pre-Qualification
  - Engineering Query
  - Cooperative Testing – Turn-Up
  - Cooperative Testing – Maintenance
  - Mechanized Pre-Qualification
  
3. Digital Designed Loops      Tariff 216, Section 3.C.1.i (Sheet 7B-7C)
  - Service Order Processing Charge
  - Installation Charge, no premises visit (initial/additional loop)
  - Installation Charge, premises visit required (initial loop)
  - Installation Charge, premises visit required (additional loop)
  - Disconnect, per loop
  - Manual Pre-Qualification
  - Engineering Query
  - Cooperative Testing – Turn-Up
  - Cooperative Testing – Maintenance
  - Mechanized Pre-Qualification
  - 2W Digital Metallic Loop 18-30k. ft., Unloaded, w/Standard Bridged Taps
    - Removal of load coils (21k ft.)
    - Removal of load coils (27k ft.)
  - 2W Digital Metallic Loop 18-30k. ft., w/all Bridged Taps Removed
    - Removal of load coils (21k ft.)
    - Removal of load coils (27k ft.)
    - Removal of Single Bridged Tap
    - Removal of Multiple Bridged Taps
  - 2W ADSL (12 or 18k ft.), w/all Bridged Taps Removed
    - Removal of Single Bridged Tap
    - Removal of Multiple Bridged Taps
  - 4W HDSL w/all Bridged Taps Removed

- Removal of Single Bridged Tap
- Removal of Multiple Bridged Taps

**B. Expanded Extended Loops      Tariff 216, Section 3.C.4.n./o./p. (Sheet 11B)**

**1. DS0 Loop Connection Charge**

- 2-Wire Analog
- 2-Wire Digital ISDN
- 4-Wire Analog

**2. DS1 Loop Connection Charge**

**3. DS3 Loop Connection Charge**

## **Appendix C**

### **List of Participants**

## Section 271 Participants

### **Active Participants**

Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc.  
ACSI Local Switched Services, Inc. d/b/a e.spire Communications, Inc.  
A.R.C. Networks, Inc. t/a InfoHighway Communications Corp.  
Association of Communications Enterprises  
AT&T Communications of Pennsylvania, Inc.  
Cavalier Telephone Mid-Atlantic LLC  
Central Atlantic Payphone Association  
Conectiv Communications (*Withdrew 3/01/01*)  
Conestoga Communications, Inc.  
Covad Communications Company  
CTSI, Inc.  
Essential.com Inc.  
FiberNet Telecommunications of Pennsylvania, LLC  
Full Service Computing Corporation t/a Full Service Networks  
The Honorable Roger A. Madigan (*Withdrew 3-28-01*)  
MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc.  
Metropolitan Telecommunications  
Penn Telecom, Inc. (*Withdrew 2-21-01*)  
Pennsylvania Cable and Telecommunications Association  
Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate  
Pennsylvania Office of Small Business Advocate  
PaPUC Office of Trial Staff  
RCN Telecom Services of Philadelphia, Inc. (*Withdrew 3-23-01*)  
Sprint Communications Co., L.P and The United Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania  
Telebeam, Inc. t/a CEI Networks  
The Honorable Mary Jo White, in her individual capacity  
Winstar Wireless of Pennsylvania, LLC (*Withdrew 4-5-01*)  
XO Pennsylvania, Inc.  
Z-Tel Communications, Inc.



## **Inactive Participants**

The Honorable Gibson E. Armstrong

ATX Licensing, Inc. d/b/a ATX Telecommunications Services, Inc.

City of Philadelphia

FairPoint Communications Solutions Corp.

Network Access Solutions Corporation

Rhythms Links, Inc.

The Honorable Robert M. Tomlinson

U.S. Department of Justice